ORIGINAL

2

3

4

OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM

000106068

CRE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION CUMUNISSION

RECEIVED

DOCKET CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

DEC 112009

DOORETED BY

COMMISSIONERS KRISTIN K. MAYES - CHAIRMAN DEC | | P 4: 18 PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY AL CURP COMMISSION

BOB STUMP

IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING REGARDING **ELECTRIC ENERGY EFFICIENCY RULES**

DOCKET NO. RE-00000C-09-0427

EXCEPTIONS OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY AND UNS ELECTRIC, INC.

Tucson Electric Power Company ("TEP"), and UNS Electric, Inc. ("UNS Electric"). collectively the "Companies", through undersigned counsel, hereby file their exceptions to the Recommended Opinion and Order ("ROO") for the Proposed Energy Efficiency Rules ("EE Rules"), submitted in this docket by the Utilities Division ("Staff") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission"). The ROO recommends that the Commission proceed with a rulemaking docket to promulgate the EE Rules, as drafted by the Staff. The Companies do not oppose the rulemaking proceeding. However, to the extent that the EE Rules do not reflect the provisions and comments provided to the Staff during the workshop process, the Companies provide the following exceptions to the ROO.¹

The EE Rules propose a regulatory framework whereby utilities will be required to reduce their energy sales through customer-oriented programs. The cost of the programs will be recovered through a surcharge imposed upon customers. The EE Rules are the latest in a series of Commission ordered rules that are intended to change the way (i) utilities provide electric service; and (ii) customers and consumers pay for electricity. For example, in recent years, the

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

The Companies have fully participated in the workshops leading up to the submission of the EE Rules. The Companies incorporate by this reference their Comments filed in the matter of the notice of proposed rulemaking regarding electric efficiency rules on 11-16-2009.

and cumulative economic and operational impact of the EE Rules and the other recently implemented Commission Rules on the utilities and their customers. Accordingly, the Company's request that the ROO be amended to require that the impact of the EE Rules and other recently implemented Commission Rules be examined in an evidentiary hearing during the rulemaking proceeding.

The EE Rules, as presently proposed, will infringe upon the Companies right to a reasonable opportunity to recover their fixed costs and earn a return on their investment. The Companies' rates were approved by the Commission premised on fixed utility costs being recovered, in part, through variable energy (kilowatt hour) sales. The EE Rules would mandate that the energy sales be reduced without any mechanism to compensate for any resultant shortfalls of fixed cost recovery. To the extent that the reduced energy sales produce a cost recovery shortfall, the EE Rules would be confiscatory. To remedy this fatal flaw, the Companies have proposed a straightforward fixed cost recovery deficiency mechanism that would operate in

between each utility's respective rate cases. Consequently, the Companies' request that the ROO

be amended to include the following provision in the EE Rules for the fixed cost recovery

"An affected utility shall file within 90 days of approval of this standard a Fixed Cost Recovery Rate supporting the per kWh cost

recovery shortfall created by reduced kWh sales due to DSM/EE programs. This Fixed Cost Recovery Rate will be equal to the

non-fuel-related variable rate approved by the ACC in the Utility's

most recent rate case. The Fixed Cost Recovery Deficiency

deficiency mechanism proposed by the Companies:

Commission has also promulgated separate sets of rules and issued decisions regarding, Demand

Side Management, Renewable Energy, Net Metering and Integrated Resource Planning (the

"recently implemented Commission Rules.") While the Companies support the principles behind

these rules, there is a growing concern that the rules and decisions are not integrated, their

standards may not be reasonably achievable, and as such may create unintended negative

consequences for utilities and customers. The Companies believe that it is imperative, and due

process requires, that the rulemaking proceeding contemplated by the ROO examine the individual

calculation shall multiply the Fixed Cost Recovery Rate by the cumulative kWh sales reductions due to DSM/EE since the Utility's last rate case. Both the Fixed Cost Recovery Rate and the cumulative DSM/EE sales reductions shall be reset coincident with the effective date of applicable changes to the Utility's rates. The affected utility shall recover the Fixed Cost Recovery Deficiency through the annual true-up of the affected utility's DSM adjustor mechanism."

The Companies reserve their rights to raise other issues and propose further modifications to the EE Rules in the proposed rulemaking docket and any additional proceedings that may arise there from. For example, the Companies are concerned that the current language in the ROO does not allow for a proper ramp up of an energy efficiency standard. Immediately requiring a 2% standard the first year in 2011 is problematic, particularly where the generally accepted ramp up is ½ to ½ percent per year. Additionally, the EE Rules do not, but should, allow for Demand Response programs to be considered in the standard.

THEREFORE, the Companies request that the Commission amend the ROO and draft EE Rules as set forth in these exceptions.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 11th day of December 2009.

Tucson Electric Power Company and UNS Electric, Inc.

By

Philip J. Dion

UniSource Energy Services

One South Church Avenue, Suite 200

Tucson, Arizona 85701

and

Michael W. Patten ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC. One Arizona Center 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Attorneys for Tucson Electric Power Company and UNS Electric, Inc.

1	Original and 13 copies of the foregoing filed this 11 th day of December 2009 with:
2	Docket Control
3	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street
4	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
5	Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered/mailed this 11th day of December 2009 to:
6	Lyn Farmer, Esq.
7	Chief Administrative Law Judge Hearing Division
8	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington
9	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
10	Janice M. Alward, Esq. Chief Counsel, Legal Division
11	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington
12	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
13	Steve Olea Director, Utilities Division
14	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington
15	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
16	Terri Ford Utilities Division
17	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington
18	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
19	Barbara Keene Utilities Division
20	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington
21	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
22	
23	By Man Spolits
24	
,,	